IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S.ANANDA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 14747 of 2005

Between:

K. Mohan babu, S/o Laxmaiah,
R/o Kampa Samudram, Marripadu Mandal, Nellore district

..... PETITIONER

AND

The Regional Manager, APSRTC., Nellore Region, Nellore District.

.....RESPONDENT

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue an order, direction or Writ more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in not issuing the notice to the petitioner is as per clause 3.7 of circular No. PD.No.43/2000 dated 11-8-2000 as the same is illegal arbitrary unjust and consequently direct the respondents to issue call letter as per circular PD NO. 43/2000, dated 11-8-2000 and appoint the petitioner as Driver.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.G.RAVI MOHAN

Counsel for the Respondent: MR.R.M.REDDY

The Court at the admission stage made the following:

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed by the petitioner seeking writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondent in not issuing any notice to the petitioner as per Clause 3.7 of circular No.PD.No.43 of 2000 dated 11-08-2000 as illegal, arbitrary and unjust, and consequently, direct the respondent to issue call letter to the petitioner and appoint him as a Driver in the respondent-Corporation.

2. According to the petitioner, he was selected and appointed as a Driver in the year 1995. But subsequently, it was found that the driving licence produced by the petitioner was not genuine, therefore, he was removed from service on 23-10-1997. Subsequently, the Corporation issued circular No.PD.No.43 of 2000 dated 11-08-2000 directing the drivers, who were removed from service on the ground of production of non-genuine licence, to obtain fresh licences and approach the Corporation. Accordingly, it is stated that the petitioner obtained fresh licence and approached the Corporation. However, the respondent did not issue any call letter to the petitioner in spite of repeated representations. Therefore, the petitioner has come up with the present writ petition.

3 . Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent-Corporation.

4 . In view of the fact that the petitioner had obtained a fresh licence in conformity with the Circular P.D.No.43 of 2000 dated 11-08-2000, it is obligatory on the part of the respondent-Corporation to consider his case on par with other similarly placed persons and engage him along with other similarly placed drivers.

5. The respondent-Corporation is accordingly directed to consider the case of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders expeditiously, preferably, within a

period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

S.ANANDA REDDY, J

22nd July, 2005

SKM

Copy to:

1 The Regional Manager, APSRTC., Nellore Region, Nellore District.

2 Two C.D. Copies.